

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/877,378	06/08/2001	Michael Nelson	Vmware 10	Vmware 10 2444	
7590 02/16/2005		EXAMINER			
VMWARE, INC			TRUONG, LECHI		
ATTN: JEFFREY PEARCE 3145 PORTER DRIVE PALO ALTO, CA 94304			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2126	•	
			DATE MAILED: 02/16/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	<del></del>				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/877,378	MICHEAL NELSON			
·	Examiner	Art Unit			
	LeChi Truong	2126			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 19 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avifinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the context o	divisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a)   they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);			
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	•			
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the			
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.			
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: 4-11,13-20,25-27,30-32,34-40,44 al	<u>nd 45</u> .				
Claim(s) objected to: NONE.		•			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,12,21-24,28,29,33 and 41-43.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: NONE.					
The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).				
		, 4			
	SUPERVISOR	NG-ALT. AN V PATENT EXAMINER			

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100 Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- 1.Applicant amendment filed on 02/03/2005 has been considered but they are not persuasive.
- 2.In the remarks, applicant argued in substance:
- (1) "Sato, no software module that initializes the computer (presumably, the control program PC)".
- (2) "Sato that there would ever be a complete context switch away from the control program".
- (3) "Sato does not teach any form of kernel" substantially displacing COS from the system level and itself running at the system level... including scheduling execution of the COS on the hardware processors".
- (4) " having a separate kernel running on a dedicated processor".
- 2. Examiner respectfully traversed Applicant's remarks:

As to the point (1), Bonola teaches the host operating system 26 is loaded from the storage device 22 into the system memory 26 at boot time (col 5, ln 1-7).

As to the point (2), "a complete context switch away from the control program" was not in the claim.

As to the point (3), Sato teaches itself running at the system level (an extended control register of the hardware 22 is controlled by the supervisor operating system, col 2, ln 31-35/ fig. 1), substantially displacing COS from the system level ... including scheduling execution of the COS on the hardware processors (the first operating system being provided with access to said first control registers by the supervisory operating system; the supervisory operating system writing a first value in the register indication bit of said extended control register when the first operating system run, col 3, ln 57-61 / ln 65-67 to col 4, ln 1-2/ col 2, ln 34-40/ ln 49-ln 50-51 / ln 55-58 and abstrac ln 8-13). Since the supervisor operating system schedules and controls the first and second operating system to access to the register of the hardware 22, the supervisor operating system displace the operating system from the system level and schedule execution of the operating system on the hardware processor (Fig. 1). Bonola also teaches itself running at the system level (loaded the real-time operating system may be excuted on the I/O processor prior to the host operating system, col 9, ln 40-43).

As to the point 4, having or not having a separate kernel running on a dedicated processor was not in the claim.